

I am a practicing attorney and I must say that I will be really irritated if the FCC decides that the ringer in my telephone is not mine, and that I have no entitlement to opt into a program (created by my representatives in State government) which requires merchandisers to ascertain whether their call is welcome in my home.

To those who insist that they need to be able to contact us at their whim because they are providing us Hoosiers a valuable service, I say, "Nonsense." Prior to my numbers being placed on the Indiana Attorney General's list, I was receiving an intolerable number of cold calls by companies who had nothing but their own fantasy that they could persuade me to buy what no one else could, by clever emphasis on juicy claims, with deliberate omission of the catches. Companies with which I had once done business were among the worst offenders -- companies which normally are perceived to be legitimate (if they are, why must they endeavor to hoodwink, which is what a lot of telemarketing seems to entail?).

We all know that long-term telephone solicitation folks must have thick skin, but their argument that we need their ability to reach us betrays a thick skull as well -- in this day and age, anyone who cannot find a credit card company, or a telephone service provider, should the urge arise, obviously has impaired capacity. I don't need to be solicited in my home or in my office -- I can find on my own the things I choose to procure.

If the FCC preempts this field and again denies us telephone privacy, perhaps our legislators should establish a presumption that any contracts procured by these cold calls are void by reason of incompetence (presumed) of the consumer-maker (note: tongue-in-cheek).

Assuming for the sake of argument that there may be occasional good derived from loosening the telephone privacy laws, the very real and definite burden created upon Hoosiers by the relentless barrage of unsolicited tele-solicitors FAR OUTWEIGHS any benefit we might have in learning of some alleged never-before-dreamed-of "hot deal." Unsolicited tele-solicitation is usually distracting at best, and is frequently counter-productive due to the frustration it can generate.

I have been told by clients that prior to the inception of the Attorney General's Telephone Privacy List, on some days the calls were so bad that tempers were stressed to the breaking point, often yielding to contagious anger. Heck, I have felt this effect myself, at times. Speaking for many Hoosiers, if not all, we do not need that.

Much of my work involves the use of my telephone. It is critical that people be able to reach me with their legitimate concerns -- a private number is not an option.

PTThank you for this information. I am a practicing attorney and I must say that I will be really irritated if the FCC decides that the ringer in my telephone is not mine, and that I have no entitlement to opt into a program (created by my representatives in State government) which requires merchandisers to ascertain whether their call is welcome in my home.

To those who insist that they need to be able to contact us at their whim because they are providing us Hoosiers a valuable service, I say, "Nonsense." Prior to my numbers being placed on your list, I was receiving an intolerable

number of cold calls by companies who had nothing but their own fantasy that they could persuade me to buy what no one else could, by clever emphasis on juicy claims, with deliberate omission of the catches. Companies with which I had once done business were among the worst offenders -- companies which normally are perceived to be legitimate (if they are, why must they endeavor to hoodwink, which is what a lot of telemarketing seems to entail?).

We all know that long-term telephone solicitation folks must have thick skin, but their argument that we need their ability to reach us betrays a thick skull as well -- in this day and age, anyone who cannot find a credit card company, or a telephone service provider, should the urge arise, obviously has impaired capacity.

If the FCC preempts this field and again denies us telephone privacy, perhaps our legislators should establish a presumption that any contracts procured by these cold calls are void by reason of incompetence (presumed) of the consumer-maker (note: tongue-in-cheek).

Assuming for the sake of argument that there may be occasional good derived from loosening the telephone privacy laws, the very real and definite burden created upon Hoosiers by the relentless barrage of unsolicited tele-solicitors FAR OUTWEIGHS any benefit we might have in learning of some alleged never-before-dreamed of "hot deal." Unsolicited tele-solicitation is usually distracting at best, and frequently counter-productive, due to the frustration it can generate. I have been told by clients that prior to the inception of your list, on some days the calls were so bad that tempers were stressed to the boiling point, often yielding to contagious anger. Heck, I have felt this effect myself, at times. Speaking for many Hoosiers, if not all, we do not need that.

PLEASE DO NOT INTERFERE WITH MY ENTITLEMENT TO FREE MY OFFICE FROM ALL OF THIS UNWANTED, UNSOLICITED TELEMARKETING.

Your consideration will be most appreciated.

Larry Dill